

NIMBUS: A Hybrid Cloud-Crowd Realtime Architecture for Visual Learning in Interactive Domains

Nick DePalma and Cynthia Breazeal
 Personal Robots Group
 MIT Media Lab
 20 Ames Str.
 Cambridge, MA 02139

Abstract—Robotic architectures that incorporate cloud-based resources are just now gaining popularity [1]. However, researchers have very few investigations into their capabilities to support claims of their feasibility. We propose a novel method to exchange quality for speed of response. Further, we back this assertion with empirical findings from experiments performed with Amazon Mechanical Turk and find that our method improves quality in exchange for response time in our cognitive architecture.

I. INTRODUCTION

Real, working, robotic systems must incorporate systemic architecture designs. The simple heterogeneity present in autonomous electro-mechanical (and biological) systems means that interfaces between differing subsystems are inevitable consequences of assembly. But while cognitive architecture research has, by definition, been inspired by biology, neuroscience, cognitive science, or psychology, we must also realize that robots are connected to resources that humans and animals don't have access to. Wireless and network connectivity allows many robots lives to be connected to internet resources to support the interaction.

Our software framework has been built over the past few decades around the idea of synthetic lifelike agents [2], and was adapted into a more embodied approach that takes into account sensors and motors and incorporates elements of interactive task learning [3] and principles of animation [4]. In our recent past, our architecture has forked into two separate initiatives: one in which emphasizes the ability to take advantage of small, embedded, and ever improving smartphones [5], [6], [7] and an architecture that emphasizes its ability to operate across small and large scale computer systems [8], [9]. This paper will focus on a simple pipeline to unify these movements to support lightweight calls to resources not available to the robot alone. With this innovation, the robot may make decisions to connect with individuals on the internet based on the availability of resources and participants not present for the agent interacting with the world.

Our server, Nimbus¹, operates as an always available resource for robots in the field and for interaction partners. Nimbus serves to collect and coordinate information from an

always-on and resilient data collection interface, crowdsource on-demand when absolutely needed by the robot, and to act as a computational resource for highly intensive processes. This paper documents underlying questions regarding speed of response and security that are highly relevant to interactive domains like human-robot interaction.

The trade-off between quality of response from people on the Internet and the speed at which a response can be obtained by an autonomous system are still not well understood. Our research group over the past few years has built a resilient cloud infrastructure to support the robots on the ground and in the field. One of the higher level features of the system is to retrieve information from databases in the cloud and when unavailable, obtain high quality labels from crowds of people on systems such as Amazon Mechanical Turk or Crowd Flower. In this paper, we measure round trip times from the robot to the crowd and back and discuss what one can expect from a system that leverages crowdsourcing as a core cognitive resource. We introduce a novel mechanism to improve quality of the response at the expense of response speed. We conclude with remarks and thoughts about the future of technology built for the purpose of efficient and interactive labeling to support interaction.

Related Work

Few architectures have integrated real-time crowdsourcing and cloud-based resources into their cognitive architectures and if these architectures have, they have not been integrated into socially intelligent robotics tasks to support these dynamic interactions. Many surveys cover the broad spectrum of research that utilizes crowdsourcing in robotic learning tasks that range from perception learning [10] to action learning [11]. For a survey on various projects that use crowdsourcing in machine learning and robotic tasks, see the comprehensive reviews by Kehoe et. al. [12], [13]. For example, the RoboEarth project vision is still the most mature vision of cloud resources integrating backend architectures to support perception, action, and mapping [14]. Rapyuta, the underlying framework, can be very powerful but it's emphasis on non-interactive tasks makes real-time latency issues secondary for their level of inquiry [15]. Details on many of these architectures are sparse, with

¹This resource is always online at <http://nimbus.media.mit.edu>




Figure 1. Cognitive Architecture for Visual Learning Problem

Rapyuta [15] and the work by Osentoski et. al. utilizing closed-loop control [16] with a single online participant providing the most concrete details. Other architectures treat crowdsourcing as a secondary or tertiary characteristic of the research process, performed after data collection to support annotation.

The research previously mentioned (except perhaps [15]) does not utilize the cloud as a resource it can autonomously decide to use when other resources are unavailable. Rapyuta manages to schedule available resources by the cloud and the real-time system using specialized scheduling algorithms in which large tasks can be scheduled to operate on cloud based hardware or on local embedded systems inside of the robot depending on the needs and demands of the entire architecture. Our system, instead, focuses on the labeling task as a source of information that can be made available on-demand through either a social interaction between the interaction partner and the robot or as an interaction it can request online.

In this work we use this crowdsourcing system to support interactive perceptual learning between the robot and its environment. To support this level of inquiry, we also review real-time perceptual learning systems. Raptor [17] is a recent (and closely related) successful dynamic training process that utilizes the power of ImageNet[18], a large database of object categories, to discover early image priors that it can use as in-situ training instances. ImageNet is used entirely for figure-ground patch discovery. These image patches can then be used to train fast whitened HOG-based object detectors dynamically throughout the interaction. This process takes under 30 seconds for new image patch to reify into an object detector. Our perception-action loop extends this type of system and allows the robot to take deictic actions toward exchanging figure-ground hypothesis enumeration with a social partner to support object discovery. This paper serves to support this perception-action loop (documented more thoroughly in [19], [20], [21]) and focuses primarily on incorporating crowd based labels into this cognitive architecture.

II. ON-THE-FLY VISUAL LABELING FROM LOCAL AND REMOTE SOURCES

Our system seeks to realize a simple abstraction: that perception-action loops help define our visual labeling task

interactively and that backend loops completed between the real-time embedded system and our servers are present to support the needs of the interactive system (see Figure 1). We have chosen a visual labeling task as this is an area where early stimuli need to be reified into abstract representations that can be reused within the interaction. Interactive visual labeling in which a system is able to take early visual stimuli and dynamically create stable object detectors (or more abstractly deictic pointers[22], [23]) in real time is still a large open problem space that is rich with potential impact.

To demonstrate the power of this system, we have built a system to learn labels both through an interaction and through our server architecture that manages an Amazon Mechanical Turk account. Figure 1 shows the cognitive architecture that surrounds our system. At the interaction level, the system utilizes gaze and deictic gesture to visually guide the robot towards relevant areas in the scene. It uses finite horizon reasoning and simple low-level cues to visually extract select image patch foregrounds from the scene. This interactive guiding process allows the robot to be directed towards stimuli it wouldn't normally be directed towards if it operated in a purely discretized object-oriented manner and to additionally use those early stimuli as training instances for socially relevant deictic and lexical referencing. In the event that the user walks away, the robot still has the ability to saccade to new stimuli and collect labels from Amazon Mechanical Turk for a small fee.

The following two sections introduce a natural tension in the crowdsourcing architecture between the trade off of speed vs quality. We introduce two methods to document the trade off that we can expect out of systems of this type. One method is what we call one-shot labeling. In one-shot labeling the system attempts to collect the label as fast as possible. The other method, called Rollover Labeling, attempts to reliably get a label in the presence of noisy, error prone, crowd responses by rolling over the result from one crowdsourcing participant to another in an attempt to correct and clarify previous labels.

III. TIME-TO-RESPONSE MEASUREMENTS

What's the shortest latency that one could expect if the robot needs the label as quickly as possible? And what do




Figure 2. Data Collection Procedure




Figure 3. Response times of two backend data collection strategies in seconds.

we lose if we want the highest quality response? In our case, our experience is that to use crowdsourcing as an on-demand resource, the robot must:

- 1) take a snapshot from its sensors
- 2) upload the data and wrap it in a visually legible and descriptive manner to a server where it can be reliably served to a participant online
- 3) find a participant to label it for a price²
- 4) wait for the participant to accept the job and read the instructions
- 5) await the response

We used our architecture to snap a picture to label from a webcam on a simple robot (see Figure 2). The image and requisite interface details were uploaded to Nimbus and a process began to synchronously wait for a response. Total round-trip times are reported in Figure 3. Our process used Amazon Mechanical Turk at a competitive rate of \$0.25 for a 45 second labeling task. We ran the experiment 20 times for each strategy.

²This seems to be the slowest process.

Figure 3 shows that one-shot labeling can be a relatively quick process. Response times for one-shot labeling fell in the range of $[12.9s, 520s]$ with a median of $37.5s$ while a rollover process fell in the range of $[95s, 1217.8s]$ with a median of 263.58 seconds, or approximately 4.3 minutes. It is clear that one-shot labeling has the potential to be a very fast process, optimistically only taking about 13 seconds!

IV. QUALITY-SPEED TRADEOFF

On the other hand, what kind of data quality can you expect out of quick 30 second one-shot label acquisition? In previous experiments[8], we found that the quality of online data can vary widely. Using the same results that we acquired from our 20 participant online experiment, we calculated the mean bounding box and use it as a baseline answer. We calculated the mean squared error (MSE) with respect to the baseline and found that rollover significantly reduced the overall error. Additionally, we saw that the responses from rollover provided a reduction in response variance. This suggests that the participants' extra time spent on the task provided a higher fidelity bounding box around the training instance and thus a higher quality result. Table I shows that while the answers can begin with many errors, rollover helps correct them and that the mean squared error of the final answer is significantly better than the one-shot labeling.

	One-Shot Labeling	With Rollover (Final)
MSE from baseline	518.6px	341.5px
Standard Deviation	22.73px	18.4px

Table I
QUALITY-SPEED TRADEOFF BETWEEN ONE-SHOT LABELING AND LABELING WITH ROLLOVER

V. DISCUSSION & FUTURE WORK

The conclusions of this experiment show that to unify a cognitive architecture that incorporates interactive perception-action loops and interactions between the robot and crowds of

people on the Internet, there is a clear need to reason about the speed at which you expect a response (if the robot is presently interacting with a scene) and the expectation of what quality of a response you can expect. Even in the best circumstance, one-shot labeling can take at least 12.74 seconds and take upwards of 4 minutes depending on the crowd response latency. Timing and scheduling when and to which interaction partners the query must be made is an interesting dynamic challenge for this always-on hybrid architecture.

In performing this experiment, other strategies have made themselves salient. For example, we found that while some of the bounding boxes and labels that were provided are rife with error, on average, Amazon Mechanical Turk workers provided good results. Our assumption was that one-shot labeling will not on average provide good results and that rollover would be needed, but instead, we found that with many answers, a researcher can statistically remove outliers based on the results of many parallel queries. This opens up the possibility to an alternate strategy from strict rollover and to parallel one-shot queries that may allow the agent to rely on the wisdom of many to remove the untrustworthiness of smaller individuals, and then to simultaneously model these workers and weight them appropriately. This parallel process may simply capitalize on one-shot labeling speed and still keep high quality results.

As we build social, embodied agents, we stake out a position that emphasizes that many of the “usable representations” must have social utility. These robots will inevitably be left to their own devices at some point in their life cycle and while we can rely on the idea that unsupervised learning can save us, this work emphasizes the idea that robots are never alone when they are connected to the Internet. It is a simple trade-off to begin to have interactions with participants on-line. Additionally, we believe that scaling our research from individual participants to groups of people to crowds of individuals allows us to begin to investigate social reasoning at a larger scale, opening up the idea of relationships between particular robotic agents in the field and particular individuals online, and opening up the possibility that an autonomous agent can begin to model the characteristics of individuals and reason about their reliability at a larger scale than ever thought possible with simple human-robot interaction alone.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially funded by the MIT Media Lab Consortia, and by NSF Grant CCF-1138986. We want to also thank Hae Won Park for her many comments on earlier drafts of this paper, Jeff Orkin for his creativity and Rob Miller for his leadership in pushing a crowdsourcing agenda that has been inspiring to everyone involved with the Cambridge Crowdfoo Initiative.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Thielman, “Man behind darpa’s robotics challenge: robots will soon learn from each other,” 2015. The Guardian. Accessed January 2016.
- [2] R. B. D. I. M. Downie and Y. I. B. Blumberg, “Creature smarts: The art and architecture of a virtual brain,” 2001.
- [3] A. L. Thomaz, *Socially guided machine learning*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2006.
- [4] C. Breazeal, A. Brooks, J. Gray, M. Hancher, J. McBean, D. Stiehl, and J. Strickon, “Interactive robot theatre,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 76–85, 2003.
- [5] K. Williams and C. Breazeal, “Reducing driver task load and promoting sociability through an affective intelligent driving agent (aida),” in *Human-Computer Interaction—INTERACT 2013*, pp. 619–626, Springer, 2013.
- [6] K. J. Williams, J. C. Peters, and C. L. Breazeal, “Towards leveraging the driver’s mobile device for an intelligent, sociable in-car robotic assistant,” in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2013 IEEE*, pp. 369–376, IEEE, 2013.
- [7] G. Gordon, C. Breazeal, and S. Engel, “Can children catch curiosity from a social robot?,” in *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*, pp. 91–98, ACM, 2015.
- [8] N. DePalma, S. Chernova, and C. Breazeal, “Leveraging online virtual agents to crowdsource human-robot interaction,” in *Proceedings of CHI Workshop on Crowdsourcing and Human Computation*, 2011.
- [9] C. Breazeal, N. DePalma, J. Orkin, S. Chernova, and M. Jung, “Crowdsourcing human-robot interaction: New methods and system evaluation in a public environment,” *Journal of Human-Robot Interaction*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 82–111, 2013.
- [10] B. C. Russell, A. Torralba, K. P. Murphy, and W. T. Freeman, “Labelme: a database and web-based tool for image annotation,” *International journal of computer vision*, vol. 77, no. 1-3, pp. 157–173, 2008.
- [11] A. Sorokin, D. Berenson, S. S. Srinivasa, and M. Hebert, “People helping robots helping people: Crowdsourcing for grasping novel objects,” in *Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 2010 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, pp. 2117–2122, IEEE, 2010.
- [12] K. Goldberg and B. Kehoe, “Cloud robotics and automation: A survey of related work,” *EECS Department, University of California, Berkeley, Tech. Rep. UCB/EECS-2013-5*, 2013.
- [13] B. Kehoe, S. Patil, P. Abbeel, and K. Goldberg, “A survey of research on cloud robotics and automation,” *Automation Science and Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 398–409, 2015.
- [14] “Roboearth: a world wide web for robots.” <http://www.robearth.org>. Accessed January 2016.
- [15] D. Hunziker, M. Gajamohan, M. Waibel, and R. D’Andrea, “Rapyuta: The roboearth cloud engine,” in *Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*, pp. 438–444, IEEE, 2013.
- [16] S. Osentoski, C. Crick, G. Jay, and O. C. Jenkins, “Crowdsourcing for closed loop control,” in *Proc. of the NIPS Workshop on Computational Social Science and the Wisdom of Crowds, NIPS*, 2010.
- [17] D. Goehring, J. Hoffman, E. Rodner, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell, “Interactive adaptation of real-time object detectors,” in *Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2014 IEEE International Conference on*, pp. 1282–1289, IEEE, 2014.
- [18] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, “Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database,” in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2009. CVPR 2009. IEEE Conference on*, pp. 248–255, IEEE, 2009.
- [19] N. DePalma and C. Breazeal, “Object discovery vs. selection in social action: Benefits of a competitive attention system,” *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2015.
- [20] N. DePalma and C. Breazeal, “Sensorimotor account of attention sharing in hri: Survey and metric,” *2nd Annual Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Human-Robot Interaction*, 2015.
- [21] N. DePalma and C. Breazeal, “Towards bootstrapping socially significant representations through robotic interaction alone: the joint guided search task,” in *Fifth International Symposium on New Frontiers in Human-Robot Interaction at the Artificial Intelligence and Simulation of Behavior Convention (AISB’16)*, 2016.
- [22] A. G. Brooks and C. Breazeal, “Working with robots and objects: Revisiting deictic reference for achieving spatial common ground,” in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCHI/SIGART Conference on Human-robot Interaction*, pp. 297–304, ACM, 2006.
- [23] D. H. Ballard, M. M. Hayhoe, P. K. Pook, and R. P. Rao, “Deictic codes for the embodiment of cognition,” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, vol. 20, no. 04, pp. 723–742, 1997.